

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated September 17, 2008.

Claims 1-11 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Applicant's Statement of Substance of Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the opportunity of a telephone interview conducted on November 19, 2008. With respect to the requirement to provide an Applicant's Statement of Substance of Interview, applicant states as follows: During the interview, applicant's representative, George Brieger, Registration No. 52,652, explained with reference to the signaling sequence chart illustrated in Figure 5 of applicant's disclosure that, according to an aspect of applicant's invention as claimed in claim 1, the radio base station receives a broadcast packet concerning a physical address inquiry and responds thereto as an agent for the mobile terminal to solve a physical address inquiry. Applicant's representative explained that such a broadcast packet concerning a physical address inquiry would have been understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art to be important in resolving a destination IP (internet protocol) address and that the cited references, including Larsson et al. do not disclose or suggest such features. The Examiner stated that he is inclined to agree that the cited art does not disclose or suggest such features and invited applicant to file a written Response in keeping with the foregoing.

Rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious from Novakov (6,571,103), in view of Larsson (6,463,307). Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action acknowledges that Novakov does not disclose or suggest receiving and discriminating by an apparatus at a first node of the radio network system broadcast packets traveling over the communication line addressed to the radio mobile terminal operating in the power-saving mode and, when a broadcast packet concerning a physical address inquiry is found among the broadcast packets traveling over the communication line addressed to the radio mobile terminal, responding to the broadcast packet by the apparatus as an agent for the radio mobile

terminal to solve the physical address inquiry, however, the Office Action had alleged that Larsson discloses such features.

As discussed and provisionally agreed to during the telephone interview, Larsson is silent with respect to processing a broadcast packet concerning a physical address inquiry, as required by claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9. Further, Larsson is silent with respect to responding to the broadcast packet by the radio base station as an agent for the radio mobile terminal to solve the physical address inquiry, as further required by claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9. Accordingly, even together in combination, Novakov and Larsson do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9.

Claim 3 depends from claim 2, claim 4 depends from claims 1 or 2, claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 5, and claims 10 and 11 depend from claims 8 or 9. Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

In view of the forgoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims of the application are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON DECEMBER 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700